UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/410,483	09/30/1999	PARTHASARATHY SARANGAM	042390.P7091	6937

7590 05/26/2006

ALOYSIUS TC AUYEUNG
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER	
WON, MICHAEL YOUNG	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/410,483	SARANGAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Y. Won	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 March 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,16-19 and 25-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,16-19 and 25-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed January 27, 2006 and Request for Continued Examination filed March 24, 2006.

2. Claims 1, 16, 25, and 27 have been amended and claims 29-30 have been cancelled.

3. Claims 1-9, 16-19, and 25-28 have been examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9, 16-17, 19, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer (US 6,253,243 B1) in view of Cowan et al. (US 6,604,137 B2).

INDEPENDENT:

As per ***claim 1***, Spencer teaches a method comprising:

detecting alert events on a client using a platform independent agent (implicit: see col.8, lines 3-4: "The mapping is based on generic trap type) integrated with said client (see col.4, lines 56-58: "agent program running in the node" and col.6, line 18: ""listener" for the event");

reporting detected alert events by said platform independent agent to a remote alert proxy (see Fig.1, #108: "Manager" and Fig.2, #208: "Management Information Server") in a platform independent manner (see col.4, lines 65-67: "manager 108 can download information from the agents" and col.5, lines 28-42: "by means of a variety of platform types") complemented by a platform type (see col.6, lines 66-67: "<enterprise> field 504 value indicates the subsystem");

sending command data to the remote alert proxy in response to the detected alert events (see Fig.5; col.6, lines 59-62; and col.7, lines 62-65: "Community String");

obtaining an identifier to identify a class of platforms from the reported detected alert events (see col.6, lines 66-67: "<enterprise> field 504 value indicates the subsystem" and col.8, lines 1-4);

mapping the identifier to a representation of a specific platform type from the class of identified platforms (see Fig.5, # 510 & Fig.7; col.7, lines 27-29; and col.8, lines 1-21); and

translating said reported alert events to platform specific alert events (see Fig.2; Fig.6; Fig.7; col.6, lines 52-55; col.8, lines 1-3: "convert traps"; col.9, lines 4-7: "trap is

converted to the CMIP event notification type"; and col.19, lines 36-41: "conversion of the SNMP traps to events") via said alert proxy (see Fig.2; col.1, lines 49-59: "management information server (MIS)"; and col.5, lines 53-60) by referring to a specific section of an event description file using the mapped representation (see col.9, lines 24-27).

Spencer does not explicitly teach of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the client.

Cowan teaches of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the client (see col.8, lines 35-42 & 54-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Cowan within the method of Spencer by implementing translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the client because Spencer teaches that when a device has experienced fault or failure, it "requires attention" (see col.2, lines 22-25) and further teaches after investigating the problem, the alarm can be "cleared" by correction (see col.2, lines 32-33). Therefore, one of ordinary skill would employ the proxy agent to correct the device generating the fault, alarm, or event by translating the hardware control data to the appropriate hardware control operations of the specific platform.

As per ***claim 16***, Spencer teaches in a server, a method comprising:

receiving detected alert events of a client device from an integrated platform independent agent of the client device (see col.5, lines 28-50 and col.6, lines 26-32: "network alarms arrive at a management protocol adapter"), in a platform independent manner (see col.4, lines 65-67: "manager 108 can download information from the agents" and col.5, lines 28-42: "by means of a variety of platform types") complemented with a platform type (see col.6, lines 66-67: "<enterprise> field 504 value indicates the subsystem");

receiving command data to the remote alert proxy in response to the detected alert events (see Fig.5; col.6, lines 59-62; and col.7, lines 62-65: "Community String");

obtaining an identifier to identify a class of platforms from the received detected alert events (see col.6, lines 66-67: "<enterprise> field 504 value indicates the subsystem" and col.8, lines 1-4);

mapping the identifier to a representation of a specific platform type from the class of identified platforms (see Fig.5, # 510 & Fig.7; col.7, lines 27-29; and col.8, lines 1-21); and

translating said reported alert events to client specific hardware control data (see Fig.2; Fig.6; Fig.7; col.6, lines 52-55; col.8, lines 1-3: "convert traps"; col.9, lines 4-7: "trap is converted to the CMIP event notification type"; and col.19, lines 36-41: "conversion of the SNMP traps to events") by referring to a platform specific section of an event description file using the mapped representation (see col.9, lines 24-27).

Spencer does not explicitly teach of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the client device.

Cowan teaches of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the client device (see col.8, lines 35-42 & 54-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Cowan within the server of Spencer by implementing translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the client device because Spencer teaches that when a device has experienced fault or failure, it "requires attention" (see col.2, lines 22-25) and further teaches after investigating the problem, the alarm can be "cleared" by correction (see col.2, lines 32-33). Therefore, one of ordinary skill would employ the proxy agent to correct the device generating the fault, alarm, or event by translating the hardware control data to the appropriate hardware control operations of the specific platform.

As per ***claim 25***, Spencer teaches a an apparatus comprising logic to:

receive detected alert events of a client device from an integrated platform independent agent of the client device (see col.5, lines 28-50 and col.6, lines 26-32: "network alarms arrive at a management protocol adapter"), in a platform independent manner (see col.4, lines 65-67: "manager 108 can download information from the

agents" and col.5, lines 28-42: "by means of a variety of platform types") complemented with a platform type (see col.6, lines 66-67: "<enterprise> field 504 value indicates the subsystem");

receive command data to the remote alert proxy in response to the detected alert events (see Fig.5; col.6, lines 59-62; and col.7, lines 62-65: "Community String");

obtain an identifier to identify a class of platforms from the received detected alert events (see col.6, lines 66-67: "<enterprise> field 504 value indicates the subsystem" and col.8, lines 1-4);

map the identifier to a representation of a specific platform type from the class of identified platforms (see Fig.5, # 510 & Fig.7; col.7, lines 27-29; and col.8, lines 1-21); and

translate said reported alert events to platform specific alert events (see Fig.2; Fig.6; Fig.7; col.6, lines 52-55; col.8, lines 1-3: "convert traps"; col.9, lines 4-7: "trap is converted to the CMIP event notification type"; and col.19, lines 36-41: "conversion of the SNMP traps to events") by referring to a specific section of an event description file using the mapped representation (see col.9, lines 24-27).

Spencer does not explicitly teach of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the device.

Cowan teaches of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the device (see col.8, lines 35-42 & 54-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Cowan within the server of Spencer by implementing translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the device because Spencer teaches that when a device has experienced fault or failure, it "requires attention" (see col.2, lines 22-25) and further teaches after investigating the problem, the alarm can be "cleared" by correction (see col.2, lines 32-33). Therefore, one of ordinary skill would employ the proxy agent to correct the device generating the fault, alarm, or event by translating the hardware control data to the appropriate hardware control operations of the specific platform.

As per ***claim 27***, Spencer teaches an article of manufacture comprising a machine-readable medium having a plurality of machine-readable instructions stored thereon, wherein when the instructions are executed by a processor, the instructions subscribe the processor to:

receive detected alert events of a device from an integrated platform independent agent device (see col.5, lines 28-50 and col.6, lines 26-32: "network alarms arrive at a management protocol adapter"), in a platform independent manner (see col.4, lines 65-67: "manager 108 can download information from the agents" and col.5, lines 28-42: "by means of a variety of platform types") complemented with a platform type (see col.6, lines 66-67: "<enterprise> field 504 value indicates the subsystem");

receive command data sent in response to the detected alert events (see Fig.5; col.6, lines 59-62; and col.7, lines 62-65: "Community String");

parse the received detected alert event, according to an encapsulation protocol, to predetermined variables (see Fig.6; col.9, lines 32-35; col.11, lines 21-25; and col.13, lines 5-9);

assign values obtained by parsing the data packet to predetermined variables (see col.1, lines 55-59 and col.13, lines 22-53); and

translate said received alert events to platform specific alert events (see Fig.2; Fig.6; Fig.7; col.6, lines 52-55; col.8, lines 1-3: "convert traps"; col.9, lines 4-7: "trap is converted to the CMIP event notification type"; and col.19, lines 36-41: "conversion of the SNMP traps to events"), wherein translating includes comparing the assigned values to an event description file to determine platform specific alert information (see col.9, lines 24-27); and

reporting the platform specific alert information in a natural language (implicit: see Fig.4, #400: "Viewer" and col.6, lines 38-49).

Spencer does not explicitly teach of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data and automatically perform hardware control operations on the device based on the control data.

Cowan teaches of translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data and automatically perform hardware control operations on the device based on the control data (see col.8, lines 35-42 & 54-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Cowan within the server of Spencer by implementing translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data and automatically perform hardware control operations on the device based on the control data because Spencer teaches that when a device has experienced fault or failure, it "requires attention" (see col.2, lines 22-25) and further teaches after investigating the problem, the alarm can be "cleared" by correction (see col.2, lines 32-33). Therefore, one of ordinary skill would employ the proxy agent to correct the device generating the fault, alarm, or event by translating the hardware control data to the appropriate hardware control operations of the specific platform.

DEPENDENT:

As per ***claim 2***, which depends on claim 1, Spencer further teaches wherein detecting said alert events on said client further comprises detecting alert events while said client is in a reduced function state (see col.6, lines 36-38).

As per ***claim 3***, which depends on claim 2, Spencer further teaches wherein said reduced function state includes an operating system hung state (see col.2, lines 22-27).

As per ***claim 4***, which depends on claim 1, Spencer further teaches wherein reporting said detected alert events further comprises: composing a network data packet (see col.16, lines 20-24), said network data packet including an event code (see col.7, lines 27-31); and transmitting said network data packet including said event code to said remote alert proxy (see col.7, lines 42-48).

As per ***claim 5***, which depends on claim 4, Spencer further teaches wherein composing said network data packet comprises encapsulating said network data packet according to at least one of a plurality of encapsulation protocols including a remote management and control protocol (RMCP) and a simple network management protocol (SNMP) (see col.2, lines 13-17).

As per ***claim 6***, which depends on claim 4, Spencer further teaches wherein said event code includes a BIOS POST code (see col.7, lines 5-15: <generic-trap> Table).

As per ***claims 7, 17, and 26***, which depend on claims 1, 16, and 25, respectively, Spencer further teaches wherein said translating (see col.7, line 66 to col.8, line 1 and col.9, lines 24-25) said reported or received alert events to platform specific events (see col.7, lines 27-31) by said alert proxy further comprises referencing a description data file using said platform type (see col.9, lines 4-7).

As per ***claims 9 and 19***, which depend on claims 7 and 17, respectively, Spencer further teaches wherein referencing said description data file comprises referencing one of a management information format (MIF) file (see col.4, lines 48-52) and a management information block (MIB) file (see col.8, lines 5-17 & 35-46).

5. Claims 8, 18, and 28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer (US 6,253,243 B1) and Cowan et al. (US 6,604,137 B2), and still further in view of Regnier et al. (US 5689708A).

As per ***claims 8, 18, and 28***, which depend on claims 7, 17, and 27, respectively, Spencer and Cowan do not explicitly teach wherein referencing or reporting said

description data file comprises referencing or reporting a plain text "ini" file. Regnier teaches wherein referencing said description data file comprises referencing a plain text "ini" file (see col.2 lines 45-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to employ the teachings of Regnier within the system of Spencer and Cowan, by making the data files be of a plain text "ini" file, because "ini" files are commonly used in servers in applying restrictions upon clients, thus making the system of Spencer more versatile and also preventing further harm to the client system.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 16, 25, and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

A. Applicant(s) argue that neither *Spencer* nor *Chari* disclose, "sending command data to the remote alert proxy in response to the detected alert events" and "translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform hardware control operations on the client".

After careful review, *Spencer* clearly teaches "sending command data to the remote alert proxy in response to the detected alert events" (see Fig.5; col.6, lines 59-62; and col.7, lines 62-65: "Community String").

The examiner agrees that neither *Spencer* nor *Chari* teaches, "translating the command data into specific client-based hardware control data to automatically perform

hardware control operations on the client", however, new reference *Cowan* et al. (US 6,604,137 B2) has been cited to explicitly teach this limitation (see rejection above).

For the reasons above claims 2-7 and 9, which depend from claim 1, claims 17 and 19, which depend from claim 16, and claim 25, which depend from claim 26, remain rejected.

B. Applicant(s) argue that *Regnier* does not cure the above-argued deficiencies and therefore is allowable for at least those reasons.

For the reasons above, *Regnier* is not relied upon to teach the asserted missing limitations of the independent claims because such limitations are clearly and explicitly taught by *Spencer* and *Cowan*. For these reasons and the rejection set forth above, claims 8, 18, and 28 remain rejected.

Conclusion

7. Claims 1-9, 16-19, and 25-28 have been rejected and remain pending with this action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Y. Won whose telephone number is 571-272-3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Won

May 25, 2006